



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,206	03/06/2000	Derek Hoeim	777.369US1	8410

23377 7590 12/18/2003
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,206

Applicant(s)

DEREK HOEIM

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 05/23/03 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 9 and 23 have been amended. However, limitation of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1-23 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (05/23/03).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 14-15, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wugofski [US. 6,317,143]
As to claim 1, Wugofski discloses one or more component tables, wherein each component table corresponds to a component of the application (column 2, lines 23-27 and lines 35-48); and a master table merged from the one or more component tables (column 2, lines 48-55).

As to claim 6, Wugofski also discloses an additional component table and wherein the master table is merged from the at least one component table and the additional component table (column 4, lines 55-67).

As to claim 7, Wugofski teaches a removed component table of the at least one component table corresponding to a removed component and wherein

the master table is merged from the remaining component tables of the at least one component table (column 4, lines 42-67).

As to claims 11, 14 and 21, Wugofski also teaches starting a host application (column 2, lines 22-28); determining if registry entries for the suite application have been altered and on registry entries being altered, remerging component tables and rebuilding a master table (column 2, lines 55-68 and column 3, lines 57-65); building default user interface components (column 2, lines 23-55) and building additional user interface components on demand (column 4, lines 55-67).

As to claim 15, Wugofski shows installing an additional component for the suite application and modifying registry entries for the suite application (column 4, lines 44-67).

As to claim 22, Wugofski discloses means for determining if a component has been added (column 4, lines 55-68); means for remerging component tables into a master table (column 3, lines 57-67) and means for building the user interface from the master table (column 3, lines 32-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-13, 16-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wugofski [US. 6,317,143] in view of Buxton et al. [US. 6,469,714].

As to claim 2, Wugofski does not disclose available command and available command vectors for the application. However, Buxton et al. shows the limitation at column 2, lines 46-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Wugofski before him at the time the invention was made to modify the suite applications in the master table as taught by Wugofski to include menus of Buxton et al., to be able to allow users to utilize a particular software product easily as taught by Buxton et al.

As to claim 3, Buxton et al. shows each component table includes at least one command for the corresponding component (column 2, line 61 through column 3, line 11).

As to claim 4, Buxton et al. also shows each command and command vector has a unique object identifier (column 6, lines 14-43).

As to claim 5, Buxton et al. teaches each command and command vector having a flag specifying visibility (column 8, lines 44-52).

As to claim 8, Buxton et al. also teaches the master including available commands, menus and toolbars and the location of each available command (column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 15).

As to claim 9, while Wugofski teaches the suite application, Buxton demonstrates commands, wherein each command corresponds to one or more components of the suite application (column 6, lines 10-42).

As to claim 10, Buxton also demonstrates each command having a master group and wherein each group having a master menu (column 31, lines 55-60 and column 32, lines 5-15).

As to claims 12 and 18, while Wugofski shows the host application, Buxton discloses building minimal menus for the host application (column 6, lines 15-43); building minimal toolbars for the host application (column 2, lines 45-65); and building minimal key bindings for the host application (column 32, lines 15-21).

As to claim 13, Buxton also discloses a user executing a command corresponding to a component, building menus, toolbars and key binding for the corresponding component (column 7, line 58 through column 8, line 100).

As to claim 16, while Wugofski shows merging the at least one component table into the master table, Buxton shows creating at least one resource text file (column 4, lines 23-58); compiling the at least one resource text file into at least one binary resource file (column 4, lines 40-60).

As to claims 17 and 19, While Wugofski teaches the master table, Buxton shows building additional menus into the unified user interface (column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 11).

As to claim 23, Buxton et al. demonstrates a command section to describe commands; groups and menus to be created (column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 15); a command placement section to specify locations for the command (column 2, lines 47-67); a visibility section to modify visibility of the commands, groups and menus (column 8, lines 43-53); and a key bindings section to associate key bindings to the commands (column 32, lines 15-21). As to claim 20, Wugofski also shows upon de-activation of a component, removing user interface controls corresponding to the component (column 4, lines 43-53).

Response to Arguments

The Applicant has argued either Wogofski or Buxton “nowhere discloses a unified user interface comprising one or more component tables and a master table”. However, Wugofski shows the unified user interface at column 2, lines 47-55. Applicant is directed to lines “Another embodiment of the present invention is a shared graphical user interface capable of control of a plurality of computer applications or applets”. And “defining a graphical user interface in response to the functionality of an application or applet comprises operating or launching a first application, retrieving functionality information of the first application, defining a graphical user interface for controlling the functionality of the fist application, and controlling the first application with the defined GUI”. Wugofski teaches a GUI having many applications which are launched into it and the GUI is built by multiple applications, so multiple

applications are controlled by the unified user interface. Also, component is a part of an application. It is inherent the Wugofski's system discloses tables in order to keep track, monitor and manage these components in the unified user interface. Wogofski shows component tables and further, the way people design a master table is dependent on implementation design.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or

draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100